IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.GIRI

THURSDAY, THE 20TH SEPTEMBER 2007 / 29TH BHADRA 1929

WP(C).No. 26586 of 2007(M)

PETITIONER:

LATHIKA R.,
F/NO.860884802, CT/GD (MAHILA0, ADM. COY,
GC, CRPF, PALLIPURAM.

BY ADV. SRI.G.SASIDHARAN CHEMPAZHANTHIYIL
SRI.S.VISHNU

RESPONDENTS:

---

1. THE ADDITIONAL DIGP,
GROUP CENTRE, C.R.P.F., PALLIPURAM,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

2. THE DEPUTY INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE,
GROUP CENTRE, C.R.P.F., PALLIPURAM,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

3. INSPECTOR GENEAL OF POLICE (PERS),
DIRECTORATE GENERAL, C.R.P.F., LODHI ROAD,
NEW DELHI-110 003.

4. THE DIRECTOR GENERAL,
CENTRAL RESERVE POLICE FORCE,
DIRECTORATE GENERAL,
LODHI ROAD, NEW DELHI-110003.

BY ADV. SRI.A.JAYASANKAR, ADDL.CGSC

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 20/09/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

V.GIRI, J.

W.P.(C).No.26586 of 2007 M

Dated this the 20th day of September, 2007.

JUDGMENT

The petitioner, a Mahila Constable in the service of the C.R.P.F., working at the group centre since 2000, is aggrieved by her transfer to New Delhi. She has placed a personal grievance in this regard before the Director General, the 4th respondent.

2. On instructions, learned standing counsel submits that the petitioner has not been relieved from her post at Pallippuram till today and a decision will be taken on her request for retention for a period of six months in the same centre before moving to New Delhi in terms of the transfer order, at the earliest.

3. I am not called upon to consider the correctness of the order of transfer, nor am I inclined to interfere with the order of transfer as such. But the request of the petitioner pointing out her personal

grievance on humanitarian consideration merits an answer at the hands of the 4th respondent.

In the circumstances, Ext.P4 may be looked into by the 4th respondent and appropriate orders passed within a period of one month from today. Till orders are passed on Ext.P4, the petitioner shall be permitted to continue at Pallippuram. I make it clear that this facility is not in recognition of any right or preference, but purely to enable the 4th respondent to consider the request contained in Ext.P4.

Writ petition is disposed of as above.

Sd/-

(V.GIRI)

JUDGE

sk/

//true copy//

P.S. To Judge